Although racial/ethnic animosity in Canada has not reached the proportions it has in regions such as the Balkans and Rwanda, Canada has yet to fully realize its promises to the diverse communities that call it home. Hate crimes are a direct threat to the basic principles of Canadian multiculturalism. They represent significant obstacles to the ability or willingness of affected communities to engage in civic culture. However, more systematic research and scholarship in this area is needed to document more concretely both the distribution and dynamics of hate crime. Learning more about the issue enhances the possibility of effective intervention.

*Barbara Perry*

**Further Readings**


**Web Sites**

Canadian Islamic Congress: http://www.canadianislamiccongress.com
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**Hawai’i, Race in**

Race both as a concept and in its operationalization are relatively recent introductions in Hawaiian history. Ideas of race did not exist in Hawai’i prior to the arrival of Europeans during the later 18th century. Indeed, it was not really until after Hawai’i was annexed by the United States in 1898 that the first racial categories appeared in an attempt to racially quantify the Hawaiian population. This racialization has had serious consequences as part of the larger experience of colonization, leaving Hawaiians—even those of mixed race—in a disadvantaged position in the land that is their home.

**The Introduction of Race**

Once European explorers, European and U.S. traders and opportunists, and Protestant, Catholic, and Mormon missionaries “discovered” Hawai’i, they quickly staked their territory. The results were devastating to the Native population on several levels. First, these foreigners, along with their Christianity and capitalism, brought with them a host of diseases—including syphilis, gonorrhea, tuberculosis, smallpox, measles, and leprosy—that killed multitudes of Hawaiians. Censuses conducted by foreign missionaries document the dramatic decline in the local population from 142,050 in 1823 to 39,504 in 1896.

Second, although alien to Hawaiians, racial categorization introduced by Westerners soon became a part of the foreign lexicon in Hawai’i. Indeed, Hawaiians themselves were becoming familiar with Western notions of race and its connection to slavery as early as the 1850s, as documented in missionary-controlled Hawaiian language newspapers. In fact, by the late 1800s, the last reigning king of Hawai’i, King Kalākaua, had requested a racial taxonomy of Hawaiians from E. Arning, a Swedish physician who had been brought in by the Hawaiian government to improve public health. However, although Hawai’i remained under what Andrew Lind referred to as the “trappings of native control,” racial categorizations of the Hawaiian population remained outside of the cultural norms and were unpracticed. Instead, Hawaiians classified the foreign population according to the cultural groups to which they belonged—U.S., British, French, Chinese, Japanese, and so on—but not along racial or color lines.
Even the term *haole*, which has become nearly synonymous with Whites or Caucasians, was not a reference to skin color in its early use. This term stems from the Hawaiian words *ha* (meaning “breath”) and *ole* (meaning “without”) in reference to people who could not speak the Hawaiian language. *Haole* was applied equally to the foreign population—White and Black alike. The term translates to “stranger” and references all non-Hawaiians in Hawai‘i regardless of skin color. Moreover, because most of the early visitors to Hawai‘i were light-skinned persons with power, *haole* increasingly came to denote exclusively influential and wealthy persons of Northern European and U.S. ancestry.

During the early part of the 20th century, U.S. military personnel further introduced to Hawai‘i an element of racial tension once relegated to the U.S. mainland. U.S. servicemen during the World War II period brought their racist attitudes with them to Hawai‘i. Derogatory terms applied to racial groups that were minorities on the mainland initiated the new territory into the mainland’s brand of racism.

Hawaiian contact with Westerners had lasting impacts on the Native population. For example, tension between the Native Hawaiian population and the military personnel remains today. There continues to be tension between Hawaiians, who face high costs of living, and military personnel, who enjoy many perks (e.g., beach access) not extended to the local population. Another legacy of Western contact with Hawaiians is the near loss of the Native Hawaiian language, which was banned from use in public schools in 1896 by the government of the newly formed Republic of Hawai‘i.

### The Plantation Economy

Western contact with Hawai‘i also led to the establishment of a non-Native economy (plantation based with sugar cane and pineapples as the primary crops) that would supplant and dominate the local subsistence economy based on fish and poi. Although early racial stratification was not manifest in the local population, a racial stratification system separating Whites from non-Whites soon emerged on the large plantations that had been established by foreign agriculturalists and businessmen.

Not unlike the plantation economy of the antibellum South in the United States, the plantation economy of Hawai‘i relied on a substantial and reliable labor supply. With the local population declining significantly and reluctant to do plantation work, planters turned to foreign sources—first to China and then elsewhere—to fill their labor needs. By 1884, the Chinese population in Hawai‘i (18,254) exceeded the Caucasian population (16,579) and was second only to Hawaiians (40,014).

However, as a form of labor control, planters who did not want to rely on a single race of workers (Chinese) sought alternate labor groups. In this respect, the Portuguese served to diversify the labor pool. Unlike the Chinese, who were largely male and planned to return to China, the Portuguese brought with them a larger proportion of women, thereby inclining them to become permanent settlers.

Japanese labor was also recruited to plantations to replenish the Native population. Japanese labor appealed to planters for a variety of reasons, including cheap passage, their apparent readiness to learn English, the quality of their work, and their thrifty ways. The number of Japanese immigrants increased significantly from 12,610 in 1890 to more than 100,000 (43% of the Hawaiian population) by 1920. However, fears of “yellow peril” incorporating both the Chinese and Japanese sent planters in search of an additional labor supply, and they turned next to the Philippines. Nonexistent in the Hawaiian population in 1900, Filipinos grew to 63,052 (17% of the total Hawaiian population) by 1930.

During a span of 50 years, the demographic composition of Hawai‘i had transformed radically. From the emergence of the first significant Chinese population in Hawai‘i in 1884 through 1930, the Native Hawaiian population saw itself diminished (from 40,014 in 1884 to 22,636 in 1930) and replaced by “part Hawaiians” (28,224), Caucasians (73,702), Chinese (27,179), Japanese (139,631), and Filipinos (63,052).

### The First Census

The demographic transformation of Hawai‘i due to the importation of foreign labor by foreign planters had been under way for 20 years when Hawai‘i was annexed by the United States in 1898. The racialization of the population of Hawai‘i was almost immediate. The 1900 census classified the population by “color,” with categories such as “Total White,” “Native White,” and “Foreign White” appearing for the first time to sort the newly incorporated Hawaiian population. At this time, the term *Negro* was first
introduced to document the Black population in Hawai‘i. Analysis of the first U.S. Census conducted in Hawai‘i confirms the use of skin color to demarcate racial categories. Europeans such as the Portuguese and Spaniards, along with light-skinned mixed-race Hawaiians, were condensed into the broader Caucasian category.

The detailed instructions provided to census enumerators on how to color code the population correctly reveal a dogmatic insistence on separating Whites from non-Whites. These social practices created two new categories of part Hawaiians: “Caucasian Hawaiians” and “Asiatic Hawaiians.” Nevertheless, even those who were part Caucasian were to be designated according to the race of the non-Caucasian parent. Equally revealing, delineations from the Hawaiian monarchy period, which distinguished among Caucasians by national origin, largely disappeared—assuming, as Lind noted, a “racial purity” of the Caucasians.

This attention to what might seem minuscule details was neither accidental nor inconsequential. Well before the United States annexed Hawai‘i in 1898, Westerners were already dominating much of Hawaiian policy. By 1852, Westerners controlled thousands of acres of prime Hawaiian land and had imposed a Western property rights system on the use of this land. Furthermore, by the early 1800s, Westerners had assumed important political positions on the islands. Indeed, two seats of the five-member Land Commission formed in 1845 were held by Westerners. In addition, strong-armed tactics by leaders in the Missionary party (Western business interests) forced King Kalākaua to relinquish most of the power of the throne in what came to be known as the Bayonet Constitution of 1887. Indeed, his successor, Queen Lili‘uokalani, was deposed as a result of her efforts to restore power to the monarchy, and U.S. interests took over in Hawai‘i.

Loss of Public Lands

Still at issue today are the million-plus acres of crown lands—public lands that had been set aside for the benefit of the Hawaiian chiefs and people in 1848 but that were ceded (some argue illegally) to the U.S. government on the annexation of Hawai‘i in 1898. One of the stated purposes of this land is the betterment of the social conditions of the Native Hawaiians, as called for by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920. The act provided for the transfer of approximately 200,000 acres of land to Native Hawaiians, who were defined as descendants with at least one-half blood quantum of individuals inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778. Lessees of this land—those who could prove 50% blood quantum—are entitled to one-fifth of the revenues generated from this land. In 1992, Hawai‘i amended this statute so that lessees could designate their spouses or children as successors provided that they could prove at least 25% blood quantum.

At the crux of the arguments over public lands and the revenues generated from them is the issue of entitlement and ownership. Did these lands belong to Native Hawaiians, or are they (and the attendant revenues) simply to help rehabilitate a dying population? Sidestepping the legality of the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy, the subsequent annexation of Hawai‘i, and the acquisition of the disputed lands, the U.S. government in 1920 decided that the Hawaiian people never had any right or title to these lands. The land served the purpose only of rehabilitating a race of people who the government concluded were in danger of extermination. This is very similar to the position that the British government took with respect to the Aborigines of Australia. Consequently, in Hawai‘i, once land and revenues were defined as an entitlement, the setting of boundaries became increasingly important in identifying beneficiaries. In particular, blood quantum definitions prevailed in the proving of one’s Hawaiianess.

Although the 1920 act delineated restrictions on the documentation of blood quantum to gain land and benefits for Hawaiians, it extended access of the land to large plantations. Sugar producers won provisions that allowed the leasing of public lands for indefinite periods of time and allowed the removal of other restrictions that had adverse impacts on their operations. At the same time, stronger restrictions—in the form of proving blood quantum—were placed on Hawaiians, making claim to the land and accompanying revenues more difficult. These disparate actions—providing greater access to corporations while limiting access to Hawaiians—served the corporate and plantation interests rather than help to “rehabilitate” Hawaiians, and indeed it deepened the racial divide between Native Hawaiians and others. Thus, the social construction of Hawaiianess as a race was formed in relation to the
shift away from their entitlement to the privileging of White property interests.

Entitlement is controlled by placing the burden of proving identity on the Native Hawaiians, whose culture was steeped in an oral tradition. Furthermore, even when the written tradition was introduced, the record keeping was often haphazard, fraught with mistakes, or (in the cases of flood and fire) lost altogether—with the effect being to intensify the actual and continuing violence of the colonization process for the Indigenous population of Hawai‘i. The racialized nature of this requirement is brought into focus more sharply when one recognizes that in Hawai‘i White people, unlike the Native Hawaiians themselves, have never needed to prove their lineage so as to claim space.

The cumulative effects of these racial politics have been largely negative for the Native Hawaiian population. Native Hawaiians share similar characteristics to other colonized populations, including high unemployment, negative health outcomes, low levels of educational attainment, and high imprisonment rates.

**Contemporary Environment**

Data from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey 2005 (ACS) are used to obtain a portrait of the demography and racial stratification in Hawai‘i today. The figures for this part of the analysis are based on the use of statistical weights to obtain population estimates from the ACS sample.

The population of Hawai‘i numbered 1,258,528 in 2005. Table 1 shows the ten most common detailed racial/ethnic categories in Hawai‘i. At the time of the survey, 54% of the state’s population was non-Hispanic White, Japanese, or Filipino. The 68,090 members of the non-Hispanic Hawaiian population constituted approximately 1 of every 19 residents of the state. An additional 32,385 persons were multiracial individuals identifying as non-Hispanic Hawaiian, or White. The other groups comprising the top ten racial/ethnic categories included non-Hispanic Chinese, Korean, and Blacks along with two Hispanic groups (Puerto Ricans and Mexicans).

Hawai‘i, however, is the most racially/ethnically diverse state in the United States. Indeed, more than one-fifth (21.3%) of the population of Hawai‘i identified with more than one race in 2005. In the nation as a whole, only 1.9% of the population categorized itself as multiracial.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial/Ethnic Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top ten groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>282,802</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Japanese</td>
<td>201,461</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Filipino</td>
<td>188,643</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Hawaiian</td>
<td>68,090</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Chinese</td>
<td>55,037</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>37,325</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>33,406</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White and Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>32,385</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Korean</td>
<td>25,643</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Black</td>
<td>21,614</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>279,089</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>33,033</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,258,528</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Socioeconomic Indicators

Racial/ethnic groups, especially non-Hispanic Hawaiian single- and multiple-race individuals, are stratified socioeconomically in Hawai‘i along three dimensions of socioeconomic status: education (percentage of persons age 25 years or older who are college graduates), occupation (average Duncan Socioeconomic Index for occupations), and poverty (percentage of population with incomes below the poverty threshold). Included in this analysis are eight non-Hispanic groups: Hawaiian, Hawaiian + White, Hawaiian + Other Asian, Hawaiian + White + Other Asian, White (the largest single racial/ethnic category in the state), Japanese, Filipino, and Chinese (the last three are the three largest Asian groups in the state).

Across the three socioeconomic indicators, single-race and multiracial Hawaiians occupy the lower rungs in the socioeconomic hierarchy (see Table 2). For example, only approximately one-sixth to one-eighth of Hawaiians age 25 years or older from these
groups have a college diploma. In contrast, more than one-third of Whites, Chinese, and Japanese have this credential. In addition, single-race and multiracial Hawaiians are employed in occupations that have relatively low levels of prestige, although Filipinos work in even less prestigious occupations. In contrast, Japanese, White, and Chinese are employed in the most prestigious jobs. Finally, single-race and multiracial Hawaiians have relatively high levels of poverty along with Chinese. These groups are two to three times more likely to be living in poverty as compared with Japanese, Filipinos, and Whites.

**Residential Patterns**

Next, the residential patterns of various groups are examined to assess the degree to which they share similar areas where they live. Sociologists commonly use the index of dissimilarity to measure the similarities in geographic residences across racial/ethnic groups. Data from the 2000 Summary File 1 (SF1) are used to assess the residential similarities among three non-Hispanic single-race groups (Hawaiians/Other Pacific Islanders, Whites, and Asians) across the 217 census tracts that comprise the Honolulu Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), the largest MSA in Hawai‘i. The index of dissimilarity (D) assesses the degree to which members of the three groups of interest share residential space. The D varies from 0 (no segregation—two groups live in the same locations) to 100 (complete segregation—two groups live in completely different areas). The D can be interpreted as the percentage of members of one group that would need to move to achieve the same geographic distribution as the other group.

The results of the analysis show a moderate level of residential segregation between Hawaiians/Other Pacific Islanders and Asians (D = 39.4) but a higher level relative to Whites (D = 48.6).

In sum, the analysis reported here using U.S. census data for 2000 and 2005 indicates that Hawaiians continue to be a relatively small part of the population of the state of Hawai‘i despite their Native roots in this land. In addition, Hawaiians continue to fare worse than other major racial groups in the state, including Whites, Japanese, Filipinos, and Chinese. Furthermore, the data show that even Hawaiians who identify with another racial identity do not fare any better than their single-race Hawaiian counterparts. Last, the Hawaiian population remains moderately segregated from Whites and Asian populations. The contemporary racial taxonomy and stratification observed in Hawai‘i reflects the historical forces that established the colonization and racialization of Hawai‘i and its people.

*Karen Manges Douglas and Rogelio Saenz*
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**Table 2** Summary Statistics Based on Selected Socioeconomic Indicators by Group, 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage of Persons Age 25 Years or Older With a College Degree</th>
<th>Average Duncan Socioeconomic Index for Occupations</th>
<th>Percentage of Persons in Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian + White</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian + Asian</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian + White + Asian</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note:* The Duncan Socioeconomic Index assigns a weighted value to the education and income of an occupation ranging from a low of 0 to a high of 97.
Hawaiians

Hawaiian refers to an indigenous group of people, kānaka maoli, Aboriginal to the Hawaiian archipelago. The first discoverers of the 1,500-mile-long Hawaiian archipelago in the Pacific Ocean, these Polynesians migrated to Hawai‘i by sea, using advanced navigation skills long before the Western world discovered the concept of longitude. There, they survived and flourished for hundreds of years prior to Western contact, evolving a complex system of resource management and developing sophisticated knowledge bases and skills to survive on these remote islands with limited resources. Their situation underwent an enormous change after the arrival of Europeans, leaving them a minority in their own homeland, as this entry discusses.

Cosmogonic and religious beliefs of Hawaiians tie the Hawaiian Islands to kānaka maoli beginning with creation or pō (darkness or obscurity). The islands were born from Papahānaumoku (earth mother) and Wākea (sky father), who also gave birth to kalo, the taro plant and main staple crop of traditional Hawaiians, and ultimately to people. As such, the histories of the land, the gods, the chiefs, and the people are all intertwined with one another and with all other aspects of the universe. In these beginnings, the archipelago is intimately connected to Hawaiians through genealogy, culture, history, and spirituality. The natural elements (land, wind, and rain) and creatures of the islands are considered as primordial ancestors; they are the older relatives of living Hawaiians. Both share an interdependent familial relationship that requires mālama (care) and kia‘i (guardianship) for the older siblings, who in turn provide for the well-being of the younger siblings.

Significant cultural values of the Hawaiian people center on the importance of ‘ohana (family), aloha ‘aina (love for the land), and mo’oku‘auhau (genealogy).